



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,481	11/21/2003	Carlton Lane	MSFT-2791/303661.01	3629
41505 7590 02/05/2008 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER PHAM, KHANH B	
			ART UNIT 2166	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/05/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,481

Applicant(s)

LANE ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh B. Pham

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 31, 2007 has been entered. Claims 1, 3, 5-26 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims **1, 3, 5, 9-13** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie et al. (US 2002/0116698 A1), in view of Glaser et al. (US 5,953,525 A), hereinafter "Lurie" and "Glaser".

As per claim 1, Lurie teaches a method for deploying a device database to a device [0008] comprising:

- “providing an interface that enables a user to generate a solution corresponding to development of at least one software application” at [0061], [0095];
- “generating a main device project within the solution for testing the at least one software application” at [0061];
- “store a device database in a main device project” at [0051]-[0052], [0090]-[0091];
- “generate a device setup project within the solution for deployment of a finish version of the at least one software application to the device” at [0095]
- “automatically copying the device database from the main device project to the device setup project without receiving explicit instruction to do so” at [0061];
- “deploying the device setup project to the device in a software development environment” at [0054]-[0055], [0092];
- “installing the device database on the device for testing of the device on which the device database is being installed” at [0051], [0054];

Lurie does not explicitly teaches the step of providing an interface that enable the user to “view stored procedures and triggers currently associated with the device database and to add and delete stored procedures and triggers which are to be associated with the device database for the main device project and the device setup project.” However, Glaser teaches a similar system for developing software project including an user interface that enable the user to “view stored procedures and triggers currently associated with the device database and to add and delete stored procedures and triggers which are to be associated with the device database for the main device

project and the device setup project” at Figs. 5, 8B and Col. 5 line 50 to Col. 6 line 55. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Glaser’s project window with Lurie’s system in order to provide “an Integrated Development Environment that is used to design, develop, deploy, and debug computer programming that accesses and display data quickly and easily” as suggested by Glaser at Col. 3 lines 20-30.

As per claim 3, Lurie further teaches: “providing an interface that enables the user to debug a test version of the device database on the device” at [0070].

As per claim 5, Lurie and Glaser teach the method of claim 4 discussed above. Lurie also teaches: “deploying the device project to the device comprises distributing a finished version of the device database to the device” at [0061].

As per claim 9, Lurie teaches a computer readable medium for deploying a device database to a device comprising the following steps:

- “providing an interface that enables a user to store a device database in a device project” at [0051]-[0052], [0090]-[0091]
- “deploying the device project to the device in a software development environment” at [0054]-[0055], [0092];

- "installing the device project to the device for testing of the device on which the device database is being installed" at [0051], [0054].

Lurie does not explicitly teaches the step of providing an interface that enable the user to "view stored procedures and triggers currently associated with the device database and to add and delete stored procedures and triggers which are to be associated with the device database for the main device project and the device setup project." However, Glaser teaches a similar system for developing software project including an user interface that enable the user to "view stored procedures and triggers currently associated with the device database and to add and delete stored procedures and triggers which are to be associated with the device database for the main device project and the device setup project" at Figs. 5, 8B and Col. 5 line 50 to Col. 6 line 55. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Glaser's project window with Lurie's system in order to provide "an Integrated Development Environment that is used to design, develop, deploy, and debug computer programming that accesses and display data quickly and easily" as suggested by Glaser at Col. 3 lines 20-30.

As per claim 10, Lurie further teaches "providing an interface that enables the user to store the device database in a main device project" at [0061], [0092].

As per claim 11, Lurie and Glaser teach the medium of claim 10, Lurie further teaches: "providing an interface that enables the user to debug a test version of the device on the device" at [0070].

As per claim 12, Lurie and Glaser teach the medium of claim 9, Lurie further teaches: "providing an interface that enables the user to store the device database in a device setup project" at [0095].

As per claim 13, Lurie and Glaser teach the medium of claim 12, Lurie further teaches: "distributing a finish version of the device database to the device" at [0061].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 6-8, 14-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie and Glaser as applied to claims 1, 3, 5 and 9-13 above, and in view of Crudele et al. (6,973,647 B2), hereinafter "Crudele".

19. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by a library catalog system.

20. With regard to claim 1, a library teaches clustering said plurality of documents (a library contains a plurality of documents that are clustered together); organizing those documents having common features into respective clusters based on the result of the clustering (libraries organize those documents into non-fiction, fiction, children's books, etc...); clustering the documents contained in the respective generated clusters (the library keeps the clusters the documents together in each respective generated cluster, e.g. non-fiction books are in the non-fiction section), and organizing those having common features into respective finer clusters (public libraries would use the Dewey decimal system to cluster documents into categories, for example, non-fiction books into cooking, travel, etc...).

21. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vaithyanathan et al [US 5,819,258].

22. With regard to claim 1, Vaithyanathan teaches clustering said plurality of documents (see col 3, lines 65-67; Figure 2); organizing those documents having common features into respective clusters based on the result of the clustering (see col 3, line 67 and col 4, lines 1-3; extracted features to create sub-clusters); clustering the documents contained in the respective generated clusters (see col 4, lines 3-6; same process is repeated for clustering the sub-clusters), and organizing those having

As per claim 6, Lurie and Glaser teach the method of claim 1 as discussed above. Lurie and Glaser does not explicitly teach "providing an interface that enables the user to select an always overwrite installation property". However, Crudele teaches a similar method for software package deployment wherein each component of the package is associated with an "providing an interface that enables the user to select an always overwrite installation property" at Figs. 3-4. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Crudele with Lurie and Glaser's teaching in order to "reduce the installation time and increase the dependability of installation of software package" as taught by Crudele at Col. 2 lines 6-8.

As per claim 7, Lurie and Glaser teach the method of claim 1 discussed above. Lurie and Glaser do not explicitly teach "providing an interface that enables the user to select an overwrite if different installation property". However, Crudele teaches a similar method for software package deployment wherein each component of the package is associated with an "providing an interface that enables the user to select an overwrite if different installation property" at Figs. 3-4. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Crudele with Lurie and Glaser's teaching in order to "reduce the installation time and increase the dependability of installation of software package" as taught by Crudele at Col. 2 lines 6-8.

As per claim 8, Lurie and Glaser teach the method of claim 1 discussed above. Lurie and Glaser do not explicitly teach “providing an interface that enables the user to select a never overwrite installation property”. However, Crudele teaches a similar method for software package deployment wherein each component of the package is associated with an “providing an interface that enables the user to select a never overwrite installation property” at Figs. 3-4. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Crudele with Lurie and Glaser’s teaching in order to “reduce the installation time and increase the dependability of installation of software package” as taught by Crudele at Col. 2 lines 6-8.

Claims 14-16 recite computer readable medium for performing method similar to claims 6-8 discussed above and are therefore rejected by the same reasons

As per claim 17, Lurie teaches a method for deploying a device database to a device comprising:

- “providing an interface that enables a user to select an installation property for installing the device database on the device” at [0095]
- “deploying a device project in which the device database is stored to the device in a software development environment” at [0091]-[0092];

- "installing the device database on the device for testing of the device on which the device database is being installed, the device database being installed according to the selected installation property" at [0069]-[0070].

Lurie does not explicitly teaches the interface that allows the user to select from amongst one or more stored procedures and triggers to be associated with the device database." However, Glaser teaches a similar system for developing software project including an user interface that enable the user to "select from amongst one or more stored procedures and triggers to be associated with the device database" at Figs. 5, 8B and Col. 5 line 50 to Col. 6 line 55. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Glaser's project window with Lurie's system in order to provide "an Integrated Development Environment" that is used to design, develop, deploy, and debug computer programming that accesses and display data quickly and easily" as suggested by Glaser at Col. 3 lines 20-30.

Lurie teaches at [0061] that "each deployment is considered an instantiation of a particular package version" but does not explicitly teaches "selected installation property being one of an always overwrite property, an overwrite if different property, and a never overwrite property" as claimed. However, Crudele teaches a similar method for software package deployment wherein each component of the package is associated with an "selected installation property being one of an always overwrite property, an overwrite if different property, and a never overwrite property" at Figs. 3-4, 9. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Crudele with Lurie and Glaser's teaching in order to "reduce the installation

time and increase the dependability of installation of software package” as taught by Crudele at Col. 2 lines 6-8.

As per claim 18, Lurie, Glaser, and Crudele teach the method of claim 17 discussed above. Lurie also teaches: “deploying the device database to the device as part of a main device project” at [0061].

As per claim 19, Lurie, Glaser, and Crudele teach the method of claim 18 discussed above. Lurie also teaches: “providing an interface that enables a user to debug a test version of the device database on the device” at [0070].

As per claim 20, Lurie, Glaser, and Crudele teach the method of claim 17 discussed above. Lurie also teaches: “deploying the device database to the device as part of a device setup project” at [0092]

As per claim 21, Lurie, Glaser, and Crudele teach the method of claim 20 discussed above. Lurie also teaches: “deploying the device database to the device comprises distributing a finished version of the device database to the device” at [0061].

Claims 22-26 recite computer readable medium for performing method similar to claims 17-21 discussed above and are therefore rejected by the same reasons.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 5-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the Claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number:
10/719,481
Art Unit: 2166

Page 12

If a reference indicated as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (571) 272-3574 for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh B. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-4116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 30, 2008

Khanh B. Pham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166

